



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/516,786	12/03/2004	Wolfgang Edeler	915-006.066	7338
4955 7590 07/01/2008 WARE FRESSOLA VAN DER SLUYS & ADOLPHSON, LLP BRADFORD GREEN, BUILDING 5 755 MAIN STREET, P O BOX 224 MONROE, CT 06468			EXAMINER DOAN, KIET M	
			ART UNIT 2617	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 07/01/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/516,786	Applicant(s) EDELER ET AL.	
	Examiner KIET DOAN	Art Unit 2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 April 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 5-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 5-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is response to Remarks file on 04/01/2008.

Claims 1, 2 and 17 are amended.

Claims 3, 4 and 18 are cancelled.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 04/01/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument that the cited reference of Osano and Suzuki fail to disclose or suggest the limitation of amended claims 1 and 17.

Examiners respectfully disagrees and maintain Osano with Suzuki's reference that read on the amended claims 1 and 17. The rejection is base on claim language, the radio frequency range 3MHz-30MHz for short wave, 535 KHz-1.7 MHz, i.e. are not found in claims 1 and 17, such radio frequency range limitation would help to over come the prior art if indicated in the claims language. Therefore, the band-pass filter of Suzuki that allow frequency within speed band is read on the "band-pass filter component are within a radio frequency range, and suppressed frequencies comprise mobile phone frequencies and audio frequencies" (Col.3. lines 12-28, Fig.2 show the microphone 31 converts a speech of voice and supplied to BBF 33 wherein the BPF 33 allow frequency components within speech band to pass through).

Therefore, examiner interpreted "band-pass filter component are within a radio frequency range, and suppressed frequencies comprise mobile phone frequencies and audio frequencies" using Suzuki as broadest reasonable interpretation. Hence the

amended claims continue to be perceived as being properly rejected by the prior art of record.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claims 1, 2, 5, 6 and 10-17** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Osano (Patent No. 6,961,591) in view of Suzuki et al. (Patent No. 6,430,217).

Consider **claims 1 and 17**. Osano teaches mobile electronic device, having comprising:

a radio receiver,

an amplifier (Col.7, Lines 36-55, Fig.6, Illustrate handheld telephone No.101 as read on radio receiver wherein contain radio receiver No.41 and amplifier), and

an audio connector for connecting to an audio reproduction component (Fig.5, Illustrate earphone No.800 as read on audio connector for connecting to an handheld telephone No.101 as read on audio reproduction component),

wherein said audio connector comprises at least one first contact and at least one second contact,

wherein said first contact is connected to ground and to an antenna input of said a radio receive, and said second contact is connected to said amplifier (Fig.1, Illustrate plug 97 (as read on connector) wherein connected to phone terminal 20 of the hand held telephone set 10 (as read on radio receiver contain antenna 26. Further, column 10, lines 43-67 and Fig. 8B described the contact of the connector/plug 97 that connected to ground by annular unit 56 and to the radio receiver/hand held telephone). Osano teaches claimed limitation as discussed above **but is silent on**

wherein a band-pass filter component is interconnected between the first contact and radio receiver, and

wherein the connection via the band-pass filter component is configured to allow a radio signal to propagate from the first contact to the antenna input of the radio receiver.

In an analogous art, Suzuki teaches “Noise eliminated digital wireless transceiver apparatus”. Further, **Suzuki teaches** wherein a band-pass filter component is interconnected between the first contact and radio receiver, and

wherein the connection via the band-pass filter component is configured to allow a radio signal to propagate from the first contact to the antenna input of the radio receiver (column 3, lines 1-20, Fig, 2, Illustrate band-pass filter 31 in interconnected between the first contact from head set 60 and radio receiver/phone unit 30).

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time that the invention was made to modify Osano with Suzuki’s system, such that mobile electronic device contain an audio

connector connecting to an audio reproduction component wherein said first contact is connected to ground, and said second contact is connected to said amplifier and contain band-pass filter component to provide means for the user when receiving audio signal without noise interference and balance the signal.

Consider **claim 2**. The combination of Osano and Suzuki teach mobile electronic device according to claim 1. Further, Suzuki teaches wherein said capacitor connected between said first contact and ground (Col.5, Lines 40-67, Fig.2, show the LBP that embed in the mobile device that contain capacitor connected between said first contact and ground).

Consider **claims 5 and 14**. The combination of Osano and Suzuki teach mobile electronic device according to claim 2. Further, Suzuki teaches wherein said capacitor has a capacity between 10 pF and 100 pF (Col.3, Lines 56-63, Col.4, Lines 15-20).

Consider **claim 6**. The combination of Osano and Suzuki teach mobile electronic device according to claim 1. Further, Suzuki teaches wherein said device comprises a mobile telephone (Fig.1, Illustrate No.30 as mobile telephone).

Consider **claim 10**. The combination of Osano and Suzuki teach mobile electronic device according to claim 1. Further, Osano teaches wherein said audio connector comprises at least one third contact connected to a component of said

electronic device (Fig.12, Illustrate as audio connector No.86 as at least one third contact connected to a component of said electronic device).

Consider **claim 11**. The combination of Osano and Suzuki teach mobile electronic device according to claim 6. Further, Osano teaches wherein said third contact is connected to a mobile phone component of said mobile electronic device, to provide a headset for the mobile phone within said mobile electronic device (Fig.12, Illustrate the limitation of claim and description).

Consider **claim 12**. The combination of Osano and Suzuki teach mobile electronic device according to claim 10. Further, Osano teaches wherein said third contact is connected to control components of said mobile electronic device, to provide a remote control functionality for the mobile electronic device (Col.14, Lines 48-67, Col. 15, Lines 1-24, Fig.12 Illustrate the limitation of claim and description).

Consider **claim 13**. The combination of Osano and Suzuki teach mobile electronic device according to claim 1. Osano teaches further comprising a direct current blocking capacitor interconnected between said first contact and said radio receiver (Col. 12, Lines 25-48, Fig.10B).

Consider **claim 15**. The combination of Osano and Suzuki teach mobile electronic device according to claim 10. Further, Osano teaches wherein said third

contact is connected to a mobile phone component of said mobile electronic device, to provide a headset for the mobile phone within said mobile electronic device (Fig.12, Illustrate the limitation of claim).

Consider **claim 16**. The combination of Osano and Suzuki teach mobile electronic device according to claim 11. Further, Osano teaches wherein said third contact is connected to control components of said mobile electronic device, to provide a remote control functionality for the mobile electronic device (Fig.12, Illustrate the limitation of claim and describe).

5. **Claim 7** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Osano (Patent No. 6,961,591) in view of Suzuki et al. (Patent No. 6,430,217) and further view of well known Prior Art (Office Notice).

Consider **claim 7**. Suzuki teaches mobile electronic device according to claim 1, but is silent on wherein said radio receiver further comprises a television receiver.

The examiner take official notice that the radio receiver further comprises a television receiver is well known in the art, the handheld device (radio receiver) can be built in a television wherein the users can plug in the head set to receiving audio.

It would have been obvious at the time that the invention was made to modify radio receiver further comprises a television receiver to provide means for the convenient of the users that can watching program in his/her mobile device.

6. **Claims 8 and 9** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Osano (Patent No. 6,961,591) in view of Suzuki et al. (Patent No. 6,430,217) and further view of Ito (Patent No. 6,203,344).

Consider **claim 8**. Osano and Suzuki teach the limitation as discussed in claim1 **but is silent on** further comprising a media player (30).

In an analogous art, Ito teaches “Jack, reproducing apparatus and data communication system”. Further, **Ito teaches** further comprising a media player (30) (Col.4, Lines 54-60, Fig. 1, Illustrate No.200 as a media player).

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time that the invention was made to modify Osano and Suzuki with Ito’s system, such that mobile electronic device further comprising a media player to provide means for device playing music which the users can listen in stereo quality.

Consider **claim 9**. The combination of Osano and Suzuki and Ito teach mobile electronic device according to claim 8. Further, Ito teaches wherein said media player (30) includes a media recorder (Col.4, Lines 13-54, Fig.1, No1. Illustrate as media recorder).

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KIET DOAN whose telephone number is (571)272-7863. The examiner can normally be reached on 8am - 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Appiah N. Charles can be reached on 571-272-7904. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2617

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Kiet Doan/
Examiner, Art Unit 2617

/Charles N. Appiah/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617